Office Action dated: February 18, 2010

Reply dated: April 19, 2010

In the Claims:

Please amend Claim 8. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally

presented claims in a continuing or future application.

1. (Previously Presented) A system that provides a generic user interface testing framework,

and allows a user to test and debug graphical user interfaces for software applications under

development, comprising:

a computer including a computer readable medium, and a processor operating thereon;

a plurality of different software test tools, wherein each software test tool is operable to test

a plurality of different graphical user interfaces (GUIs) for a plurality of different software

applications, wherein each GUI is operable to receive a plurality of input commands, and wherein

each software test tool is associated with a different tool-specific scripting language that is an

abstraction of the plurality of input commands for each of the plurality of different GUIs, used only

by that software test tool, that can be invoked by a user to test each GUI;

a test case input file stored on the computer readable medium, that contains a plurality of

directives that are logical abstractions of actions that can be performed on a GUI, independent of

any of the tool-specific scripting languages, wherein the test case input file can be edited and

reused as necessary by the user to specify different directives for testing against a software

application's GUI in any of the different software test tools; and

an interpretive engine that executes on the computer, and that includes a plurality of

dynamically loaded libraries corresponding to the plurality of different software test tools, and

including at least one library for each of the plurality of different software test tools wherein each

library is a group of functions written in each tool-specific scripting language, wherein the

interpretive engine receives the directives defined in the test case input file, identifies which libraries

are required, loads the required libraries associated with the software test tool the user is currently

using, maps the directives to the software test tool's associated tool-specific scripting language,

uses the software test tool to perform the testing operations on the software application's GUI using

•

the associated tool-specific scripting language, and reports to the user the success or failure of the

testing operations.

2. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 1 wherein the system includes the software test

tools stored locally on a computer processing system containing the user interface testing

framework.

- 2 -

Office Action dated: February 18, 2010

Reply dated: April 19, 2010

3. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 1 wherein software test tools are stored at

another computer processing system or machine.

4. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 1 further comprising a rules-based wizard that

guides the user to edit or create the test case input file by choosing the testing operations to be

included in the test case input file wherein the rules-based wizard maps the testing operations to

directives.

5. (Canceled).

6. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 1 wherein the test case input file is created

offline and subsequently communicated to the interpretive engine.

7. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 1 wherein any of the software test tools can be

removed and replaced with another software test tool.

8. (Currently Amended) A method for providing a generic user interface testing framework that

allows a user to test and debug graphical user interfaces for software applications under

development, comprising the steps of:

providing a plurality of different software test tools, wherein each software test tool is

operable to test a plurality of different graphical user interfaces (GUIs) for a plurality of different

software applications, wherein each GUI is operable to receive a plurality of input commands, and

wherein each software test tool is associated with a different tool-specific scripting language that is

an abstraction of the plurality of input commands for each of the plurality of different GUIs, used

only by that software test tool, that can be invoked to test each GUI;

allowing a user to enter a test case input file stored on [[the]] a computer readable medium,

that contains a plurality of directives that are logical abstractions of actions that can be performed

on a GUI, independent of any of the tool-specific scripting languages, wherein the test case input

file can be edited and reused as necessary by the user to specify different directives or testing

against a software application's GUI in any of the different software test tools; and

using a plurality of dynamically loaded libraries corresponding to the plurality of different

software test tools, and including at least one library for each of the a plurality of different software

test tools wherein each library is a group of functions written in each tool-specific scripting

language, to receive the directives defined in the test case input file, identify which libraries are -3-

D | (N OD40) 045401100

Attorney Docket No.: ORACL-01513US0

M:\nfeld\wp\ORACL\1500s\1513US0\1513US0 RespFOA 021810.doc

Office Action dated: February 18, 2010

Reply dated: April 19, 2010

required, load the required libraries associated with the software test tool the user is currently using,

map the directives to the software test tool's associated tool-specific scripting language, use the

software test tool to perform the testing operations on the software application's GUI, including

translating the directives to tool-specific commands, and report to the user the success or failure of

the testing operations.

9. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 8 wherein the software test tools are stored

locally on a same computer or machine as the software application under development.

10. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 8 wherein the software test tools are stored at

another computer or machine as the software application under development.

11. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 8 further comprising a rules-based wizard that

guides the user to edit or create the test case input file by choosing the testing operations to be

included in the test case input file wherein the rules-based wizard maps the testing operations to

directives.

12. (Canceled).

13. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 8 wherein the test case input file is created

offline and subsequently communicated to the interpretive engine.

14. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 8 wherein any of the software test tools can be

removed and replaced with another software test tool.

15. (Previously Presented) A computer readable medium including instructions stored thereon

which when executed cause the computer to perform the steps of:

providing a plurality of different software test tools, wherein each software test tool is

operable to test a plurality of different graphical user interfaces (GUIs) for a plurality of different

software applications, wherein each GUI is operable to receive a plurality of input commands, and

wherein each software test tool is associated with a different tool-specific scripting language that is

an abstraction of the plurality of input commands for each of the plurality of different GUIs, used

- 4 -

only by that software test tool, that can be invoked to test each GUI;

allowing a user to enter a test case input file stored on the computer readable medium, that

Attorney Docket No.: ORACL-01513US0

M:\nfeld\wp\ORACL\1500s\1513US0\1513US0 RespFOA 021810.doc

Office Action dated: February 18, 2010

Reply dated: April 19, 2010

contains a plurality of directives that are logical abstractions of actions that can be performed on a

GUI, independent of any of the tool-specific scripting languages, wherein the test case input file can

be edited and reused as necessary by the user to specify different directives for testing against a

software application's GUI in any of the different software test tools; and

using a plurality of dynamically loaded libraries corresponding to the plurality of different

software test tools, and including at least one library for each of the a plurality of different software

test tools wherein each library is a group of functions written in each tool-specific scripting

language, to receive the directives defined in the test case input file, identify which libraries are

required, load the required libraries associated with the software test tool the user is currently using,

map the directives to the software test tool's associated tool-specific scripting language, use the

software test tool to perform the testing operations on the software application's GUI, including

translating the directives to tool-specific commands, and report to the user the success or failure of

the testing operations.

16-17. (Canceled).

18. (Previously Presented) The computer readable medium of claim 15 further comprising a

rules-based wizard that guides the user to edit or create the test case input file by choosing the

testing operations to be included in the test case input file wherein the rules-based wizard maps the

testing operations to directives.

19. (Canceled).

20. (Previously Presented) The computer readable medium of claim 15 wherein the test case

input file is created offline and subsequently communicated to the interpretive engine.

21. (Previously Presented) The computer readable medium of claim 15 wherein any of the test

software tools can be removed and replaced with another test software tool.

22. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 1, wherein the system defines a contract

interface for use as an entry point in loading the libraries corresponding to the plurality of different

software test tools, and wherein additional software test tools that use a different scripting language

can be dynamically plugged into the system at the entry point by defining an execution interface of

those additional software test tools to comply with the contract interface.

- 5 -

Office Action dated: February 18, 2010

Reply dated: April 19, 2010

23. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 8, further comprising defining a contract

interface for use as an entry point in loading the libraries corresponding to the plurality of different

software test tools, wherein additional software test tools that use a different scripting language can

be dynamically plugged in at the entry point by defining an execution interface of those additional

software test tools to comply with the contract interface.

24. (Previously Presented) The computer readable medium of claim 15 further comprising

instructions which when executed cause the computer to perform the additional step of defining a

contract interface for use as an entry point in loading the libraries corresponding to the plurality of

different software test tools, wherein additional software test tools that use a different scripting

language can be dynamically plugged in at the entry point by defining an execution interface of

those additional software test tools to comply with the contract interface.

25. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 1 wherein each software test tool is used only

for execution of the test case input file, and the test case input file is built independently of any

software test tool.

26. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 1 wherein a first tool-specific scripting language

associated with a first software test tool is mapped to a second tool-specific scripting language

associated with a second software test tool, enabling test cases written in the second tool-specific

scripting language to be executed by the first software test tool.

- 6 -